

Makarow, Irina (OCD)

From: SShumwayl@aol.com
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2001 8:52 PM
To: efsec@ep.cted.wa.gov
Subject: Flooding Comments on SE2's Draft Supplemental EIS

To Whom it May Concern:

After reviewing the supplemental EIS, we continue to have concerns about flooding in the area.

The SEIS states (p. 3.6-1) "that a 2-inch rise in the 100-year flood elevation would result from the filling of the site." In Sumas and the surrounding area, two inches would cause a devastating amount of damage. In the floods of the early nineties, the federal government bought out numerous houses in Sumas to get residents and buildings out of the floodway. Two more inches could necessitate the buying out of the entire town of Sumas. Is SE2 prepared for that kind of fiscal responsibility?

The SEIS also states on p. 3.6-4 that there was not yet an unsteady-state flood model and that results would be based on the "existing steady-state analysis" (which "appear" to be overestimated). Since the last major floods, other changes, including NO DREDGING of the Nooksack River have contributed to the potential flooding of this sensitive area. In addition, major roads (on which transmission may depend) in the area were damaged or destroyed as result of flooding. Do we want electrical catastrophes of this magnitude to occur as result of increased flooding caused by SE2?

Finally, the SEIS seems to "mitigate upon mitigations" and then some. The final sentence on page 3.6-4 says that "excavation to increase flood storage could result in loss of specific terrestrial habitat that would need to be mitigated." When and where does the mitigation stop?

When considering flooding implications, the SEIS does not adequately concerns.

Sincerely,

Paige and Ladd Shumway

RECEIVED

OCT 16 2001

ENERGY FACILITY SITE
EVALUATION COUNCIL